

REMARKS

Claims 29-38 and 40-59 are pending in this application.

Claims 29, 58 and 59 have been amended by the present Amendment.

Amended claims 29, 58 and 59 do not introduce any new subject matter.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of (1) claims 29-36 and 40-59 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,610,822 ("Murphy") in view of International Application Pub. No. WO 00/38951 ("Mathias"), U.S. Patent No. 6,300,880 ("Sitnik") and U.S. Patent No. 6,614,912 ("Yamada"); (2) claim 37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murphy in view of Mathias, Sitnik and Yamada as applied to claim 29, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,311,302 ("Berry"); and (3) claim 38 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murphy in view of Mathias, Sitnik and Yamada as applied to claim 29, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,243,645 ("Moteki").

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references, when taken alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest that (1) the at least two wireless transmitters are each wired to the audio bus to receive the audio signals from each of the plurality of input devices via the audio bus at a first input position, and are each wired to receive the SEL input at a second input position, as essentially recited in amended claim 29; (2) the two wireless transmitters are each wired to the audio bus to receive the audio signals from each of the plurality of input devices coupled to the audio bus, via the audio bus at a first input position, and are each wired to receive the SEL input at a second input position, as essentially recited in amended claim 58; and (3) the two

wireless transmitters are each wired to the audio bus to receive the audio signals from each of the at least two input devices via the audio bus at a first input position, and are each wired to receive the SEL input at a second input position, as essentially recited in amended claim 59.

For example, referring to Fig. 1A of Applicants' disclosure, the two wireless transmitters 128 and 130 are each wired to the audio bus 172 to receive the audio signals from each of the plurality of input devices 190 via the audio bus 172 at a first input position, and are each wired to receive the SEL input at a second input position.

In contrast to the claimed embodiments, Applicants respectfully submit that none of the cited references, either alone, or in combination, disclose the claimed configuration of the transmitters, including the connection to the audio bus at a first input position, and the connection to the SEL input at a second input position.

Referring to Murphy, the Examiner appears to rely on the scheduler/controller 24 as disclosing the claimed video and audio bus, the combination of the scheduler/controller 24 and the lines 35 and 37 as disclosing the claimed transmitters, and the selection signals generated by processor 18 and user input controls 32 as disclosing the SEL input.

Applicants submit that Murphy, as interpreted by the Examiner, does not disclose the claimed configuration of the transmitters each being wired to the audio bus to receive the audio signals from each of the plurality of input devices via the audio bus at a first input position, and each being wired to receive the SEL input at a second input position.

For example, the scheduler/controller 24 is receiving multiple inputs from the

video, CD ROM and CD units 26, 28 and 30. However, there is no disclosure in Murphy that the scheduler/controller or the combination of the scheduler/controller and the lines 35 and 37 is wired to an audio bus to receive the audio signals from each of the plurality of input devices via the audio bus at a first input position.

Further, although the scheduler/controller receives user input controls, in order for the headphones 40a-40n to receive a selected program, it appears that all of the programs still have to be sent via line 37 and portion 36, and that any separation into individual programs may not occur until immediately before the audio signals reach the headphones 40a-40n. Accordingly, it is not clear from the disclosure Murphy whether there is a "transmitter" in Murphy that both receives an SEL input at a second input position, and also transmits the audio output of a selected input device, as essentially recited in claims 29, 58 and 59.

For at least the above reasons, Applicants maintain that amended claims 29, 58 and 59 are patentable over the cited references.

For at least the reason that claims 2-38 and 40-57 depend from claim 29, claims 2-38 and 40-57 are also submitted to be patentable over the cited references.

As such, Applicants request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of claims 29-38 and 40-59 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

DEPENDENT CLAIMS

Applicants have not independently addressed the rejections of all the dependent claims because Applicants submit that, in view of the amendments to the claims presented herein and, for at least similar reasons as why the independent claims from which the dependent claims depend are believed allowable as discussed, *supra*, the dependent claims are also allowable. Applicants however, reserve the right to address any individual rejections of the dependent claims should such be necessary or appropriate.

An early and favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner has any further questions or comments, the Examiner may telephone Applicants' Attorney to reach a prompt disposition of this application.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael F. Morano
Reg. No. 44,952
Attorney for Applicants

F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC
130 Woodbury Road
Woodbury, NY 11797
(516) 692-8888